CosmicFish Validation Notes V1.0

Marco Raveri[1,2,3], Matteo Martinelli[4,5], Gong-Bo Zhao[6,7] and Yuting Wang[6,7]

[1] *SISSA - International School for Advanced Studies, Via Bonomea 265, 34136, Trieste, Italy*
[2] *INFN, Sezione di Trieste, Via Valerio 2, I-34127 Trieste, Italy*
[3] *INAF-Osservatorio Astronomico di Trieste, Via G.B. Tiepolo 11, I-34131 Trieste, Italy*
[4] *Institute Lorentz, Leiden University, PO Box 9506, Leiden 2300 RA, The Netherlands*
[5] *Institut für Theoretische Physik, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Philosophenweg 16, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany.*
[6] *National Astronomy Observatories, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing, 100012, P.R.China*
[7] *Institute of Cosmology & Gravitation, University of Portsmouth, Dennis Sciama Building, Portsmouth, PO1 3FX, UK*

(Dated: July 5, 2016)

These notes show and comment the examples that have been used to validate the CosmicFish code. We compare the results obtained with the code to several other results available in literature finding an overall good level of agreement. We will update this set of notes when relevant modifications to the CosmicFish code will be released or other validation examples are worked out.
The CosmicFish code and the package to produce all the validation results presented here are publicly available at `http://cosmicfish.github.io`.
The present version is based on CosmicFish Jun16.

PACS numbers: 98.80

arXiv:1607.01005v1 [astro-ph.CO] 4 Jul 2016

Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. CMB Forecasts 2
A. Planck Blue Book and CMBpol 2
B. Planck 2015 3

III. Redshift Drift Forecasts 4

IV. Supernovae Forecasts 5

V. Weak Lensing Forecasts 6

VI. Galaxy Clustering Forecasts 6

Acknowledgments 6

References 9

I. INTRODUCTION

In [1, 2] we introduced the CosmicFish code as a powerful tool to perform forecast on many different models with future cosmological experiments.
In this set of notes we show the validation pipeline that was used for the code. We compared the results obtained with the CosmicFish code to other results in literature. We find an overall good level of agreement.
Together with these notes we release a CosmicFish package that contains the relevant code to produce all the results presented here. This package is going to be updated as new validation results become available. The CosmicFish code and its validation package are publicly available at `http://cosmicfish.github.io`.

II. CMB FORECASTS

A. Planck Blue Book and CMBpol

The validation package contains forecasted results for the *Planck* mission, obtained using *Planck* Blue Book specifications [3], and for the proposed CMBpol satellite [4].
CosmicFish is used varying the standard 6 parameters ($\Omega_b h^2$, $\Omega_c h^2$, τ, n_s, $\log(10^{10} A_s)$, h), from now on dubbed as S6, and the number of relativistic species N_{eff}.
The results are compared with what is obtained in Section III.C of [5]; even though these results were obtained with MCMC methods, CosmicFish bounds and degeneracies show a very good agreement (see Figure 1 and Table I).



FIG. 1: Contour plots between N_{eff} and standard parameters. Moving clockwise from top left panel, these can be compared with Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6 of [5]. Blue and red contours here correspond to blue and green contours on the paper.

Parameter	Fiducial	*Planck* 68% c.l. bound	CMBpol 68% c.l. bound
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.0227	0.0002	5×10^{-5}
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.11	0.003	0.0005
$100\theta_{MC}$	1.041	0.0005	9×10^{-5}
τ	0.09	0.004	0.003
n_s	0.963	0.007	0.002
$\log 10^{10} A_s$	3.18	0.01	0.005
N_{eff}	3.0	0.2	0.04

TABLE I: 68% confidence level bounds on cosmological parameters obtained through *Planck* and CMBpol forecasts. This can be compared with Table IV of [5].

B. Planck 2015

The CMB pipeline is also validated using *Planck* 2015 real performances specifications [6], which allow to produce bounds on the cosmological parameters mimicking the performances of the real experiment. Figure 2 and Table II show the results obtained varying the S6 parameters both using only temperature spectra and including also EE and TE.

A comparison of the TT results with [7] highlights good agreement with the *Planck* 2015 results, with the exception of the τ and A_s parameters, due to the fact that in our analysis the *lowP Planck* polarization at small multipoles is not included. More complicated is the comparison when the polarization spectra are considered; the *Planck* likelihood analysis relies on a modelization of foreground effects based on some nuisance parameters, which is not yet included in CosmicFish. In order to partially mimic the effect of these parameters on the constraining power brought by CMB polarization, we strongly reduce the sky fraction f_{sky} observed for polarization to 0.01. The bound obtained this way are compatible with *Planck* 2015 results.

Parameter	Fiducial	TT 68% c.l. bound	$TT + TE + EE$ 68% c.l. bound
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.0222	0.0002	0.0001
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.12	0.002	0.002
θ	1.0407	0.0004	0.0004
τ	0.08	0.03	0.02
$\log(10^{10} A_s)$	3.09	0.05	0.04
n_s	0.964	0.005	0.004
h	0.673	0.009	0.008
Ω_m	0.32	0.01	0.01
$sigma_8$	0.83	0.02	0.01

TABLE II: 68% confidence level bounds on cosmological parameters obtained using *Planck* 2015 TT only and *Planck* 2015 $TT + TE + EE$ to be compared with the second and fifth column of Table 3 of [7].



FIG. 2: Contour plots for standard cosmological parameters obtained with *Planck* 2015 TT only (red contours) and with the combination $TT + TE + EE$ (blue contours), to be compared respectively with the red and blue contours of Figure 6 of [7].

III. REDSHIFT DRIFT FORECASTS

CosmicFish includes a Fisher matrix forecast module for redshift drift. This observable, considered alone, is not strongly constraining so we expect results to be biased by non-Gaussian features in the likelihood. We therefore validate this observables only in combination with CMB forecast.

As of redshift drift observations we consider E-ELT specifications as used in [8][1], while for CMB we use *Planck* Blue Book specifications.

In this case CosmicFish is used with S6 parameters to which the possibility of a constant w_0 different from -1 is added. The results are then compared with Section V of [8], finding a good agreement with the MCMC results obtained there (see Figure 3 and Table III). Notice that bounds are slightly looser in our analysis; this is due to the inclusion of an HST prior in the analysis of [8].

[1] notice these are not the most up to date specifications for E-ELT redshift drift measurements; they are used only for validation purposes.



FIG. 3: Contour plots between Ω_m and h (left panel) and between Ω_m and w_0. These plots can be compared respectively with the green contours of Figures 5 and 4 of [8].

Parameter	Fiducial	*Planck*+E-ELT 68% c.l. bound
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.0226	0.0001
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.1109	0.0009
$100\theta_{MC}$	1.0397	0.0003
h	0.71	0.01
Ω_m	0.27	0.01
w_0	−1.0	0.05

TABLE III: 68% confidence level bounds on cosmological parameters obtained through *Planck*+E-ELT forecasts. This can be compared with Table II of [8].

IV. SUPERNOVAE FORECASTS

The CosmicFish Supernovae pipeline is validated using as free parameters only the constant Dark Energy equation of state parameter w_0 and the baryon and cold dark matter densities $\Omega_b h^2$ and $\Omega_c h^2$. The bounds on w_0 and the derived parameter Ω_m are obtained combining the performances of the surveys used in [9] (low-z, SDSS, SNLS, HST) and the results are compared with the same paper.
What is shown in Figure 4 and Table IV is that the obtained bound on the parameters agree with the results of [9], although the contour plot of Ω_m and w_0 can't reproduce the non-Gaussian behavior of the actual posterior.

Parameter	Fiducial	68% c.l. bound
Ω_m	0.2	0.1
w_0	−0.9	0.3

TABLE IV: 68% confidence level bounds on cosmological parameters to be compared with the first row of Table 6 of [9].



FIG. 4: Contour plot between Ω_m and w_0 to be compared with Figure 4 of [9].

V. WEAK LENSING FORECASTS

The validation package also contains Weak Lensing forecasted bounds, obtained using the optimistic and pessimistic specifications for a ground based Dark Energy Task Force Stage IV (DETFIV) experiment [10]. Results are compared with what is obtained in the Weak Lensing section of the DETF document [10]. While the optimistic case is in good agreement with the DETF forecasts, the pessimistic case is less degraded in CosmicFish results; this is easily explained by the fact that we do not include the same systematic effects as in DETF pessimistic forecasts.

Parameter	Fiducial	Pessimistic case	Optimistic case
Ω_Λ	0.73	0.006	0.005
w_0	−1.0	0.05	0.05
w_a	0.0	0.2	0.2

TABLE V: 68% confidence level bounds on cosmological parameters Dark Energy parameters to be compared respectively with WL-IVLST-p and WL-IVLST-p entries of the Table at page 77 of [10].

VI. GALAXY CLUSTERING FORECASTS

The CosmicFish Galaxy Clustering pipeline is validated obtaining bounds on cosmological parameters using DES specifications found in [11]. As in this paper, the varying parameters are S6, the energy density of massive neutrinos $\Omega_\nu h^2$ and the Dark Energy equation of state parameters w_0 and w_a.
Results shown in Figure 5 and Table VI show a very good agreement with that is found in [11].

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Ana Achúcarro, Carlo Baccigalupi, Erminia Calabrese, Stefano Camera, Luigi Danese, Giulio Fabbian, Noemi Frusciante, Bin Hu, Valeria Pettorino, Levon Pogosian, Giuseppe Puglisi and Alessandra Silvestri for useful and helpful discussions on the subject. We are indebted to Luca Heltai for help with numerical algorithms.



FIG. 5: Contour plots for several parameter combinations, to be compared with the blue dashed contours of Figure 11 of [11]

Parameter	Fiducial	*Planck*+DES 68% c.l. bound
w_0	-1.0	0.3
w_a	0.0	0.8
Σm_ν	0.32	0.08

TABLE VI: 68% confidence level bounds on the sum of neutrino masses and on Dark Energy equation of states parameters. To be compared with the third row, fifth column of Table V and fourth row, second column of Table VII of [11].

MM is supported by the Foundation for Fundamental Research on Matter (FOM) and the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research / Ministry of Science and Education (NWO/OCW). MM was also supported by the DFG TransRegio TRR33 grant on The Dark Universe during the preparation of this work. MR acknowledges partial support by the Italian Space Agency through the ASI contracts Euclid-IC (I/031/10/0) and the INFN-INDARK

initiative. MR acknowledges the joint SISSA/ICTP Master in High Performance Computing for support during the development of this work. MR thanks the National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Science for the hospitality during the initial phases of development of this work. MR and MM thank the Galileo Galilei Institute for Theoretical Physics for the hospitality and the INFN for partial support during the completion of this work. GBZ and YW are supported by the Strategic Priority Research Program "The Emergence of Cosmological Structures" of the Chinese Academy of Sciences Grant No. XDB09000000, and by University of Portsmouth. YW is supported by the NSFC grant No. 11403034.

[1] M. Raveri, M. Martinelli, G. Zhao and Y. Wang, arXiv:1606.06273 [astro-ph.CO].
[2] M. Raveri, M. Martinelli, G. Zhao and Y. Wang, arXiv:1606.06268 [astro-ph.CO].
[3] Planck - The Scientific Programme http://sci.esa.int/jump.cfm?oid=47334
[4] J. Bock et al. (2009) arXiv:0906.1188
[5] S. Galli, M. Martinelli, A. Melchiorri, L. Pagano, B. D. Sherwin and D. N. Spergel, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 123504 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.123504 [arXiv:1005.3808 [astro-ph.CO]].
[6] R. Adam *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.01582 [astro-ph.CO].
[7] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].
[8] M. Martinelli, S. Pandolfi, C. J. A. P. Martins and P. E. Vielzeuf, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 123001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.123001 [arXiv:1210.7166 [astro-ph.CO]].
[9] A. Conley *et al.* [SNLS Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192** (2011) 1 doi:10.1088/0067-0049/192/1/1 [arXiv:1104.1443 [astro-ph.CO]].
[10] A. Albrecht *et al.*, astro-ph/0609591.
[11] A. Zablocki, arXiv:1411.7387 [astro-ph.CO].